arXiv:1405.5842v1 [q-fin.MF] 22 May 2014

Stationarity of Bivariate Dynamic Contagion Processes

Angelos Dassios*, Xin Dong†

Abstract

The Bivariate Dynamic Contagion Processes (BDCP) are a broad class of bivariate point processes characterized by the intensities as a general class of piecewise deterministic Markov processes. The BDCP describes a rich dynamic structure where the system is under the influence of both external and internal factors modelled by a shot-noise Cox process and a generalized Hawkes process respectively. In this paper we mainly address the stationarity issue for the BDCP, which is important in applications. We investigate the stationary distribution by applying the the Markov theory on the branching system approximation representation of the BDCP. We find the condition under which there exists a unique stationary distribution of the BDCP intensity and the resulting BDCP has stationary increments. Moments of the stationary intensity are provided by using the Markov property.

Keywords Bivariate dynamic contagion process, piecewise deterministic Markov processes, Stationarity.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010) 60G55, 60F05, 60G35

1 Introduction

Multivariate point processes are used to model event arrivals of different types within a system. There are many potential applications; stochastic models are needed for events such as company bankruptcies, insurance claim arrivals, disease incidence, machine failures and many others. Modelling the point process in way that capture a rich dependence structure becomes an essential problem. Moreover, stationarity is an important and common assumption in many statistical applications and is also one of the most important probability properties in stochastic process study. Hence, the existence of a version of a point process with stationary increments and stationary intensity needs to be investigated.

In order to describe a system with a rich dynamic reflecting both external impact and internal contagion effect, we introduce the Bivariate Dynamic Contagion Process (BDCP). The BDCP is a broad family of bivariate point processes with intensity processes specified as non-diffusion Piecewise Deterministic Markov Processes (PDMP) studied by Davis[15] but also incorporating a feedback mechanism (internal contagion). The BDCP covers two distinct important classes of point processes. The first class consists of shot-noise Cox processes that usually describe point process systems under the impact from external factors. Shot-noise Cox processes are studied by Cox and Isham[9], Møller[27], Dassios and Jang[12], and Klüppelberg and Mikosch[24] for example. The class has a wide range of applications. For instance, it is adopted in modelling insurance claim arrivals and ruin probabilities by Altmann

*Department of Statistics, London School of Economics and Political Science, London WC2A 2AE, UK. Email: a.dassios@lse.ac.uk

†Department of Mathematics, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ, UK. Email: x.dong10@imperial.ac.uk

et al.[3], Albrecher and Asmussen[2] and Macci and Torrisi[26]. The second class consists of generalized Hawkes process which have mutually-exciting intensities. In this class, jumps in the point process bring the internal feedback into the underlying intensity process and the impact factor is modelled by upward jumps with random marks. This class is capable to model clustering and contagion effects. Hawkes processes are introduced by Hawkes and Oakes[21], and they are studied by Daley and Vere-Jones[10], Liniger[25] and Embrechts et al.[17]. Recently Hawkes processes are extensively applied in finance and insurance modelling as Hautsch[6], Aït-Sahalia et al.[1], Bacry et al.[4] and Errais et al.[18].

In the univariate case, Dassios and Zhao[13] introduce Univariate Dynamic Contagion Processes (UDCP) that include impact by both external and internal factors. They can be used in credit risk and insurance modelling as in Dassios and Zhao[28] and [14]. However, in practice a univariate model is not sufficient to model a heterogeneous population with rich dependence structure. In order to address this issue, we introduce a bivariate system. The dependency between marginals can be characterized in a few ways. Dassios and Jang[22] studied a bivariate system with correlated shot-noise components and self-exciting components but the dependence due to the cross-exciting contagion effect is missing. We address this in our definition of BDCP. Note that the cross-exciting dependency introduces a loop structure that makes the system difficult to be decoupled. Hence it is fundamentally different from the univariate case. Moreover, the BDCP is also different from the bivariate Hawkes process since it is not obvious how the additional external factor modelled by a Cox process and randomness from jump sizes affect the probability properties of the system. In principle, applications of Hawkes or shot-noise processes can be extended using BDCP to incorporate richer structure.

Once the dynamic of the point process is specified, stationarity becomes an important issue to address. It is a reasonable assumption and many problems can be simplified based on it. With stationarity of the intensity, Dassios and Zhao[14] discuss the ruin probability in insurance modelling using the UDCP. Moreover, Dassios and Dong[11] explore the diffusion approximation of BDCP with filtering applications based on the stationarity assumption.

Previously, Costa[8] discusses the stationarity condition of piecewise deterministic Markov processes in general. Dassios and Zhao[13] show the existence of a stationary distribution for UDCP. Brémaud and Massoulie[7] discuss the stationarity and stability of Hawkes processes. Furthermore, in our approach the BDCP can be seen as a limit of finite dimensional affine processes where the dimension is tending to infinity. This is itself an interesting case that is not dealt in the affine literature so far. One can look into Duffie et al.[16], Keller-Ressel et al.[23] and a few others for the research on affine processes. We note that the stationarity results are only available in a few cases of diffusion affine processes. For example, the discussion of the stationarity of two-factor diffusive affine processes can be found in Glasserman and Kim[20] and Barczy et al.[5].

In this paper, the analysis of the BDCP intensity is based on the approximation of the finite branching system resulting from the cluster-based representation. We apply the PDMP theory developed by Davis[15] on the branching system to explore the limiting distribution as $t \to \infty$. Moreover, the link between the stationary distribution and limiting distribution is explored.

The definition and the cluster representation of the BDCP are provided in Section 2, where we introduce a finite system $(\lambda^{1,n}, \lambda^{2,n})$ that approximates the BDCP intensity (λ^1, λ^2) and a finite joint system $(\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(2n)})$ resulting from a dimension translation. Then in Section 3, starting from the finite joint system $(\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(2n)})$ which is a Markov process and de-coupled, we apply the PDMP theory to obtain the limiting distribution as $t \to \infty$ in terms of the Laplace transform. With the the branching system approximation as $n \to \infty$, the condition of the existence of the limiting distribution of (λ^1, λ^2) is investigated. The

limiting distribution result can be found in Theorem 3.4 and the existence condition is the Condition 3.1. In Section 4, again starting from $(\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(2n)})$, we provide a stationarity condition in Lemma 4.1, which is in terms of the Laplace transform based on the Markov theory. As we have found in Section 3 the limiting distribution of the finite joint system that is a natural candidate, we confirm the limiting distribution is also the stationary distribution for $(\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(2n)})$ and $(\lambda^{1,n}, \lambda^{2,n})$ in Theorem 4.2 and Corollary 4.7 respectively. The approximation argument is applied to conclude the stationarity of tbe BDCP intensity (λ^1, λ^2) in Theorem 4.4 and also BDCB (N^1, N^2) in Corollary 4.7. In Section 5, we provide the stationary moments of the intensity process (λ^1, λ^2). We conclude in Section 6.

2 The Model

2.1 Model

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space, on which we introduce the Bivariate Dynamic Contagion Processes (BDCP) as a class of bivariate point processes $N_t = (N_t^1, N_t^2)$ defined on $\mathbb{R}_+$. Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a filtration such that N is $\mathbb{F}$-adapted. For $i = 1, 2$,

$$N_t^i = \sum_{n \geq 1} 1_{\{T_n^i \leq t\}}$$

where $\{T_n^i\}_{n \geq 0}$ are orderly $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times representing event arrival times with $T_0 = 0$. By the Doob-Meyer decomposition, there exists a unique non-decreasing process A starting at 0, such that $N - A$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-local martingale. Suppose that there exists a non-negative, $\mathbb{F}$-predictable and integrable intensity process λ, s.t. for every $t \geq 0$, $A_t = \int_0^t \lambda_s ds$ *a.s.* We assume that the filtration $\mathbb{F}$ satisfies the usual condition.

For N_t as a BDCP, its intensity processes $\lambda_t = (\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2)$ is specified as a Piecewise Deterministic Markov Processes (PDMP) introduced by Davis[15].

Definition 2.1 (Bivariate Dynamic Contagion Processes (Intensity-based))**.** *The intensity $\lambda_t = (\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2)$ of the BDCP $N_t = (N_t^1, N_t^2)$ with $t \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_t^1 &= \lambda_0^1 e^{-\delta_1 t} + \sum_{S_j^1 < t} Y_j^1 e^{-\delta_1 (t - S_j^1)} + \sum_{T_j^1 < t} Z_j^{1,1} e^{-\delta_1 (t - T_j^1)} + \sum_{T_j^2 < t} Z_j^{1,2} e^{-\delta_1 (t - T_j^2)}, \\ \lambda_t^2 &= \lambda_0^2 e^{-\delta_2 t} + \sum_{S_j^2 < t} Y_j^2 e^{-\delta_2 (t - S_j^2)} + \sum_{T_j^1 < t} Z_j^{2,1} e^{-\delta_2 (t - T_i^1)} + \sum_{T_j^2 < t} Z_j^{2,2} e^{-\delta_2 (t - T_j^2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

For $k, k' = 1, 2$,

- $\lambda_0^k \geq 0$ *is the initial intensity at time $t = 0$;*
- $\delta_k > 0$ *is the constant rate of exponential decay;*
- $\{S_j^k\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ *are jump times of M_t^k, which is a Poisson process with the constant intensity ρ_k. $\{Y_j^k\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ are associated i.i.d jump sizes with the distribution function $H_k(\cdot)$ and Laplace transform $\hat{h}_k(\cdot)$;*
- $\{T_j^k\}_j$ *are jump times of N^k, and $\{Z_j^{k,k'}\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ are i.i.d. jump sizes with distribution function $G_{k,k'}(\cdot)$ and Laplace transform $\hat{g}_{k,k'}(\cdot)$;*
- $\{S_j^k\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ *and $\{T_j^k\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ are independent of $\{Y_j^k\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ and $\{Z_j^{k,k'}\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$.*

Due to the exponential decay, $\lambda_t = (\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2)$ is a piecewise deterministic Markov process (PDMP). For $k, k' = 1, 2$, the marked point process $\sum_{S_j^k < t} Y_j^k e^{-\delta_k (t - S_j^k)}$ characterizes the dependence on an external factor. $\sum_{T_j^k < t} Z_j^{k,k} e^{-\delta_k (t - T_i^k)}$ and $\sum_{T_j^{k'} < t} Z_j^{k,k'} e^{-\delta_k (t - T_j^{k'})}$ for $k' \neq k$ characterize the internal dependence due to the self-exciting and cross-exciting effect respectively. Note that the impact factor is modelled by random marks that are independent of N.

From the intensity-based definition, the BDCP is a broad class of point processes covering two distinct and important point process classes. The first class is the shot-noise Cox processes that can be obtained by setting $Z_j^{k,k'} \equiv 0$ for all $j \geq 1$, $k, k' \in \{1, 2\}$. The second class is the bivariate Hawkes processes with exponential decay obtained by setting $Y_j^k \equiv 0$ and $Z_j^{k,k'}$ as constants for all j, $k, k' \in \{1, 2\}$. We assume the following condition always holds.

Condition 2.2. *(C1) For $k, k' = 1, 2$, all random marks $\{Y_j^k\}_j$ and $\{Z_j^{k,k'}\}_j$ have the finite first moments. i.e. μ_{H^k}, $\mu_{G^{k,k'}}$ are finite.*

One can easily check that under $(C1)$ in Condition 2.2, $\int_0^t \lambda_s ds < \infty$ *a.s.* for every $t \geq 0$, thus the BDCP N is non-explosive.

2.2 Stationarity

First recall the definition of the stationary distribution and the stationary process for Markov processes (e.g. Section 9.4 in Ethier and Kurtz[19]). Suppose that a martingale problem for $\mathcal{A}$ on state space E is well defined, then μ as a probability measure on E is a stationary distribution of $\mathcal{A}$ if every solution X of the martingale problem for $(\mathcal{A}, \mu)$ is a stationary process, that is, if $\mathbb{P}(X_{t+s_1} \in \Gamma_1, \ldots, X_{t+s_k} \in \Gamma_k)$ is independent of $t \geq 0$ for all $k \geq 1$, $0 \leq s_1 \leq \cdots \leq s_k$, and $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_k \in \mathcal{B}(E)$. Moreover, μ is a stationary distribution for $\mathcal{A}$ if and only if X_t has the distribution μ for all $t \geq 0$.

For a Markov process X that solves the martingale problem for $(\mathcal{A}, \mu)$ with the domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, Proposition 9.2, Chapter 4 in Ethier and Kurtz [19] provides a stationarity theorem:

$$\text{The stationary distribution } \mu \text{ exists if and only if for } f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}),\ \int_E \mathcal{A}f(x) d\mu(x) = 0. \quad (2)$$

In this paper, we find a sufficient condition $(C2)$ in Condition 3.1, under which, there exists a unique stationary distribution of λ and also a unique stationary distribution for the BDCP N in Section 4.

2.3 The Branching Structure

Note that the intensity process $\lambda_t = (\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2)$ has a representation as a cluster process with a branching structure. The representation is helpful in the following analysis.

Definition 2.3 (Bivariate Dynamic Contagion Processes (Cluster-based))**.** *A bivariate dynamic contagion processes $N = (N^1, N^2)$ is a two-type Poisson cluster process (C^1, C^2) with the branching interpretation as follows:*

- *For $k = 1, 2$, the cluster centers of type k are immigrants arrived at $\{T_m^{k,(0)}\}_{m=1,2,\ldots}$ as a shot-noise process with intensity $\lambda_t^{k,(0)} = \lambda_0^k e^{-\delta_k t} + \sum_{m=1}^{M_t^k} Y_m^k e^{-\delta_k (t - S_m^k)}$, where $\{S_m^k\}_m := T_m^{k,(0)}$.*

- *Each cluster center of type k at $T_m^{k,(0)}$ generates a cluster C_m^k consisting of events of type k and also the cluster center itself. Then the cluster $C^k = \cup_{m=1}^{\infty} C_m^k$. In branching term, each C_m^k is the set of type k immigrant arrived at $T_m^{k,(0)}$ and its offspring of all generations.*

- *Denote the set of the n-th generation offspring of type k in the cluster C_m^k as $C_m^{k,(n)}$, then the collection of the n-th generation offspring of type k from all clusters is $C^{k,(n)} = \cup_{m=1}^{\infty} C_m^{k,(n)}$. Denote the offspring birth process in $C^{k,(n)}$ as $N_t^{k,(n)}$ with the arrival times $\left\{T_j^{k,(n)}\right\}_j$ and the intensity $\lambda_t^{k,(n)}$. Recursively, the $(n+1)$-th generation from all clusters are generated with the intensity*

$$\lambda_t^{k,(n+1)} = \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{1,(n)}} Z_j^{k,1,(n)} e^{-\delta_k (t - T_j^{1,(n)})} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{2,(n)}} Z_j^{k,2,(n)} e^{-\delta_k (t - T_j^{2,(n)})},$$

  where for $k, k' = 1, 2$, the random marks $Z_j^{k,k',(n)}$ are independent copies of $Z_j^{k,k'}$ for all n.

- *Collect all individuals of type k up to the n-th generation from all clusters, denoted as $C^{k,n}$, then $C^{k,n} = \cup_{j=1}^{n} C^{k,(j)}$. The offspring birth process in $C^{k,n}$ is $N_t^{k,n}$ with birth times $\left\{T_j^{k,n}\right\}_j$ and the intensity process $\lambda_t^{k,n}$. Hence, we have*

$$N_t^{k,n} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} N_t^{k,(i)}, \quad \lambda_t^{k,n} = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \lambda_t^{k,(i)}, \quad \left\{T_j^{k,n}\right\}_j = \cup_{i=0}^{n} \left\{T_j^{k,(i)}\right\}_j.$$

Clearly,

$$C^k = \lim_{n\to\infty} C^{k,n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \cup_{j=1}^{n} C^{k,(j)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \cup_{j=1}^{n} \cup_{m=1}^{\infty} C_m^{k,(j)}.$$

By construction, all clusters $\{C_m^k\}_{m=1,2,\ldots}$ are independent. Moreover, we have pathwise,

$$\begin{aligned} N_t^k &= \lim_{n\to\infty} N_t^{k,n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} N_t^{k,(i)}, \\ \lambda_t^k &= \lim_{n\to\infty} \lambda_t^{k,n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{n} \lambda_t^{k,(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

We call $N^n = (N^{1,n}, N^{2,n})$ as the BDCP with truncated finite system that is with intensity $\lambda^n = (\lambda^{1,n}, \lambda^{2,n})$.

From the bivariate system to the univariate system In the next section, we will apply the Markov theory to analyse the joint distribution of generations of type 1 and 2. To simplify the multi-type problem, we merge the bivariate branching system into a univariate system, such that the i-th generation of type 1 and type 2 offspring become the $(2i-1)$-th and $2i$-th generation in the new univariate system. Denote the birth time of the n-th generation in the new system as $\{T_j^{(n)}\}_j$ and the counting process as $N_t^{(n)}$ with intensity $\Lambda_t^{(n)}$, then for $i = 1, 2, \ldots,$

$$\Lambda_t^{(2i-1)} = \lambda_t^{1,(i)}, \quad \Lambda_t^{(2i)} = \lambda_t^{2,(i)}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_t^{(1)} &= \lambda_0^1 e^{-\delta_1 t} + \sum_{i=1}^{M_t^1} Y_i^1 e^{-\delta_1\left(t-T_i^{1,(0)}\right)}, \\
\Lambda_t^{(2)} &= \lambda_0^2 e^{-\delta_2 t} + \sum_{i=1}^{M_t^2} Y_i^2 e^{-\delta_2\left(t-T_i^{2,(0)}\right)}, \\
\Lambda_t^{(2i+1)} &= \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(2i-1)}} Z_j^{1,1} e^{-\delta_1\left(t-T_j^{(2i-1)}\right)} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(2i)}} Z_j^{1,2} e^{-\delta_1\left(t-T_j^{(2i)}\right)}, \\
\Lambda_t^{(2i+2)} &= \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(2i-1)}} Z_j^{2,1} e^{-\delta_2\left(t-T_j^{(2i-1)}\right)} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^{(2i)}} Z_j^{2,2} e^{-\delta_2\left(t-T_j^{(2i)}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by construction, the original branching system is recovered by:

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_t^{1,n} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Lambda_t^{(2i-1)}, \quad N_t^{1,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_t^{(2i-1)}, \\
\lambda_t^{2,n} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Lambda_t^{(2i)}, \quad N_t^{2,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} N_t^{(2i)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the original bivariate system with truncation up to n-th generation is transformed into a univariate system with truncation up to m-th generation with $m = 2n$. We call m and n as the system index for the transformed and original system respectively.

Denote the limiting distribution when $t \to \infty$ and the stationary distribution:

- $\left(\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(m)}\right)$: π_A^m and π_S^m
- $\left(\lambda^{1,n}, \lambda^{2,n}\right)$: μ_A^n and μ_S^n
- $\left(\lambda^1, \lambda^2\right)$: μ_A^* and μ_S^*

3 Markov Property and Limiting Distributions

We use the Markov property and the PDMP theory to explore the limiting distributions of the intensities in this section. In the next section, we build the relationship between the limiting distribution and the stationary distribution.

3.1 Markov Property

Though the intensity $(\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2)$ is a Markov process, it is difficult to explore the stationarity using the PDMP theory as they are coupled due to the cross-exciting components. Moreover, it is not obvious how we can find the condition on the intensity process such that the existence and stationarity can be analyzed. Hence, the finite system with the branching structure introduced above will be used for the stationarity analysis.

The finite system $(\lambda_t^{1,n}, \lambda_t^{2,n})$ and is not Markovian, but the joint system $\left(\Lambda_t^{(1)}, \Lambda_t^{(2)}, \ldots, \Lambda_t^{(m)}\right)$ is. The generator of $\left(t, \Lambda_t^{(1)}, \Lambda_t^{(2)}, \ldots, \Lambda_t^{(m)}\right)$ is $\mathcal{A}_m$ with domain $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_m)$. For any $f \in$

$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}_m)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{A}_m f(t,\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m) \\
= \; & \frac{\partial f}{\partial t} - \sum_{i=1}^{m} \delta_i \lambda_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_i} + \rho_1 \left[\int_0^\infty f(\lambda + e_1 y) dH_1(y) - f(\lambda) \right] + \rho_2 \left[\int_0^\infty f(\lambda + e_2 y) dH_2(y) - f(\lambda) \right] \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{2k-1} \left[\left(\int_0^\infty f(\lambda + e_{2k+1} z) dG_{1,1}(z) - f(\lambda) \right) + \left(\int_0^\infty f(\lambda + e_{2k+2} z) dG_{2,1}(z) - f(\lambda) \right) \right] \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{2k} \left[\left(\int_0^\infty f(\lambda + e_{2k+1} z) dG_{1,2}(z) - f(\lambda) \right) + \left(\int_0^\infty f(\lambda + e_{2k+2} z) dG_{2,2}(z) - f(\lambda) \right) \right],
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m)$ and $e_i := (0, \ldots, 0, 1, 0, \ldots) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ where only the i-th element is 1 and others are all 0.

Take $f\left(t, \Lambda_t^{(1)}, \cdots, \Lambda_t^{(m)}\right) = e^{-B_1(t)\Lambda_t^{(1)} - \cdots - B_m(t)\Lambda_t^{(m)} + c_m(t)}$ and suppose it is a martingale. Consider for any $T > 0$ and assume that $B_i(T) = v_i$ and $c_m(0) = 0$, then the Laplace transform of $(\Lambda_T^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda_T^{(m)})$ conditional on the initial condition $\Lambda_0 = (\Lambda_0^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda_0^{(m)})$ at $(v_1, \ldots, v_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ is

$$
\mathbb{E}_0 \left[e^{-v_1 \Lambda_T^{(1)} - \cdots - v_m \Lambda_T^{(m)}} \right] = \mathbb{E}_0 \left[e^{-B_1(T)\Lambda_T^{(1)} - \cdots - B_m(T)\Lambda_T^{(m)}} \right] = e^{-B_1(0)\Lambda_0^{(1)} - \cdots - B_m(0)\Lambda_0^{(m)} - c_m(T)}.
$$

A sufficient condition for f to be a martingale is $\mathcal{A}_m f(t, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_m) = 0$ for any t, $\{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^m$, ρ_1, ρ_2 on $\mathbb{R}_+$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 = \frac{\mathcal{A}_m f}{f} \; = \; & \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{2k-1} \left[-\dot{B}_{2k-1}(t) + \delta_1 B_{2k-1}(t) + (\hat{g}_{1,1}(B_{2k+1}(t)) - 1) + (\hat{g}_{2,1}(B_{2k+2}(t)) - 1) \right] \\
& + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{2k} \left[-\dot{B}_{2k}(t) + \delta_2 B_{2k}(t) + (\hat{g}_{1,2}(B_{2k+1}(t)) - 1) + (\hat{g}_{2,2}(B_{2k+2}(t)) - 1) \right] \\
& + \lambda_{2n-1} \left[-\dot{B}_{2n-1}(t) + \delta_1 B_{2n-1}(t) \right] + \lambda_{2n} \left[-\dot{B}_{2n}(t) + \delta_2 B_{2n}(t) \right] \\
& + \dot{c}_m(t) + \rho_1 \left(\hat{h}_1(B_1(t)) - 1 \right) + \rho_2 \left(\hat{h}_2(B_2(t)) - 1 \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, the sequence of functions $(B_i(t))_{i=1}^m$ solves the backward recursive ODE system $(k = 1, \ldots, n-1)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\dot{B}_{2n}(t) + \delta_1 B_{2n}(t) &= 0, \quad B_{2n}(T) = v_{2n}, \\
-\dot{B}_{2n-1}(t) + \delta_2 B_{2n-1}(t) &= 0, \quad B_{2n-1}(T) = v_{2n-1}, \\
-\dot{B}_{2k-1}(t) + \delta_1 B_{2k-1}(t) + (\hat{g}_{1,1}(B_{2k+1}(t)) - 1) + (\hat{g}_{2,1}(B_{2k+2}(t)) - 1) &= 0, \quad B_{2k-1}(T) = v_{2k-1}, \\
-\dot{B}_{2k}(t) + \delta_2 B_{2k}(t) + (\hat{g}_{1,2}(B_{2k+1}(t)) - 1) + (\hat{g}_{2,2}(B_{2k+2}(t)) - 1) &= 0, \quad B_{2k}(T) = v_{2k}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover,

$$
\dot{c}_m(t) + \rho_1 \left(\hat{h}_1(B_1(t)) - 1 \right) + \rho_2 \left(\hat{h}_2(B_2(t)) - 1 \right) = 0, \quad c_m(0) = 0.
$$

We transform the system that is backward in the system index and the time into a forward system by taking

$$
l_k(t) := B_{m+1-k}(T-t) = B_{2n+1-k}(T-t).
$$

By construction $\Lambda_0^{(1)} = \lambda_0^1, \Lambda_0^{(2)} = \lambda_0^2$ and $\Lambda_0^{(j)} \equiv 0$ for $j > 2$, then the Laplace transform becomes

$$\mathbb{E}_0\left[e^{-v_1\Lambda_T^{(1)}-\cdots-v_m\Lambda_T^{(m)}}\right] = e^{-l_m(T)\Lambda_0^{(1)}-\cdots-l_1(T)\Lambda_0^{(m)}-c_m(T)} = e^{-l_{2n}(T)\lambda_0^1-l_{2n-1}(T)\lambda_0^2-c_m(T)}, \quad (3)$$

where $l_i(t)$ and $c_m(t)$ solves the forward ODE system: with $k = 1, \ldots, n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{l}_1(t) + \delta_2 l_1(t) &= 0, \quad l_1(0) = v_{2n},\\
\dot{l}_2(t) + \delta_1 l_2(t) &= 0, \quad l_2(0) = v_{2n-1},\\
\dot{l}_{2k+1}(t) + \delta_2 l_{2k+1}(t) - (1 - \hat{g}_{1,2}(l_{2k}(t))) - (1 - \hat{g}_{2,2}(l_{2k-1}(t))) &= 0, \quad l_{2k+1}(0) = v_{2(n-k)},\\
\dot{l}_{2k+2}(t) + \delta_1 l_{2k+2}(t) - (1 - \hat{g}_{1,1}(l_{2k}(t))) - (1 - \hat{g}_{2,1}(l_{2k-1}(t))) &= 0, \quad l_{2k+2}(0) = v_{2(n-k)-1},\\
\dot{c}_m(t) - \rho_1\left(1 - \hat{h}_1(l_{2n}(t))\right) - \rho_2\left(1 - \hat{h}_2(l_{2n-1}(t))\right) &= 0, \quad c_m(0) = 0.
\end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that the ODE system (4) has a unique and explicit solution in a recursive form

$$\begin{aligned}
l_1(t) &= v_{2n}e^{-\delta_2 t},\\
l_2(t) &= v_{2n-1}e^{-\delta_1 t},\\
l_{2k+1}(t) &= v_{2(n-k)}e^{-\delta_2 t} + e^{-\delta_2 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_2 s}\left[1 - \hat{g}_{1,2}(l_{2k}(s)) + 1 - \hat{g}_{2,2}(l_{2k-1}(s))\right] ds,\\
l_{2k+2}(t) &= v_{2(n-k)-1}e^{-\delta_1 t} + e^{-\delta_1 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_1 s}\left[1 - \hat{g}_{1,1}(l_{2k}(s)) + 1 - \hat{g}_{2,1}(l_{2k-1}(s))\right] ds.
\end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Moreover,

$$c_m(T) = \rho_1\int_0^T\left[1 - \hat{h}_1(l_{2n}(t))\right] dt + \rho_2\int_0^T\left[1 - \hat{h}_2(l_{2n-1}(t))\right] dt.$$

3.2 Limiting Distributions

We first introduce the following crucial condition.

Condition 3.1.

(C2) The spectral radius of the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} \frac{\mu_{G^{2,2}}}{\delta_2} & \frac{\mu_{G^{1,2}}}{\delta_2} \\ \frac{\mu_{G^{2,1}}}{\delta_1} & \frac{\mu_{G^{1,1}}}{\delta_1} \end{bmatrix}$ *is less than* 1.

Remark 3.2. *The spectral radius condition in the condition above is equivalent to the following*

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\mu_{G^{1,1}}}{\delta_1} + \frac{\mu_{G^{2,2}}}{\delta_2} + \sqrt{\left(\frac{\mu_{G^{1,1}}}{\delta_1} + \frac{\mu_{G^{2,2}}}{\delta_2}\right)^2 + 4\frac{\mu_{G^{1,2}}}{\delta_2}\frac{\mu_{G^{2,1}}}{\delta_1}}\right) < 1. \quad (6)$$

The following lemma shows a necessary condition of the existence of the limiting distribution. It also indicates that the limiting distribution is independent from the initial condition with (3).

Lemma 3.3. *For any* $i = 1, \ldots, m$, *and* $(v_1, \ldots, v_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} l_i(t) = 0.$$

Proof. See Section A.1. □

Then the Laplace transform (3) of the limiting distribution of the univariate finite system $(\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(m)})$ at any $(v_1, \ldots, v_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_A^m(v_1, \ldots, v_m) &:= \lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_0\left[e^{-v_1\Lambda_T^{(1)} - \cdots - v_m\Lambda_T^{(m)}}\right] \\ &= \exp\left(-\rho_1 \int_0^\infty \left[1 - \hat{h}_1(l_{2n}(t))\right] dt - \rho_2 \int_0^\infty \left[1 - \hat{h}_2(l_{2n-1}(t))\right] dt\right). \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In the following theorem, we provide the existence condition for the limiting distributions.

Theorem 3.4 (Existence of Limiting Distributions)**.**
(1) Under Condition $(C1)$*, as* $t \to \infty$*, the limiting distributions* π_A^m *of* $\left(\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(m)}\right)$ *and* μ_A^n *of* $\left(\lambda^{1,n}, \lambda^{2,n}\right)$ *exist.*
(2) Under Condition $(C1)$ *and* $(C2)$*, as* $t \to \infty$*, the limiting distribution* μ_A^* *of* $\left(\lambda^1, \lambda^2\right)$ *exits.*

Proof. (1) Since for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$1 - \hat{h}_1\left(l_{2k}(t)\right) = \int_t^\infty d\hat{h}_1\left(l_{2k}(u)\right) = \int_t^\infty \hat{h}_1'(l_{2k}(u))\dot{l}_{2k}(u)du \le \mu_{H^1} l_{2k}(t). \tag{8}$$

Hence $\int_0^\infty \left[1 - \hat{h}_1\left(l_{2k}(t)\right)\right] dt \le \mu_{H^1} \int_0^\infty l_{2k}(t)dt$ and (7) becomes

$$\hat{\pi}_A^m(v_1, \ldots, v_m) \ge \exp\left(-\rho_1\mu_{H^1} \int_0^\infty l_{2n}(t)dt - \rho_2\mu_{H^2} \int_0^\infty l_{2n-1}(t)dt\right). \tag{9}$$

In order to show the existence of the limiting distribution π_A^m, it is sufficient to show that $\begin{bmatrix} \int_0^\infty l_{2n-1}(t)dt \\ \int_0^\infty l_{2n}(t)dt \end{bmatrix}$ is finite and thus the process does not explode as $t \to \infty$.

From (5), for all $j = 1, \ldots, 2n$, and $t \ge 0$, the function $l_j(t)$ is increasing with the initial value v_{2n+1-j}. We construct a sequence of functions $\{L_j(t)\}_{j=1}^{2n}$ that is the solution to the forward ODE system (4) with the initial value

$$L_{2k-1}(0) = v_2^* = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} v_{2i}, \quad L_{2k}(0) = v_1^* = \max_{i=1,\ldots,n} v_{2i-1} \quad \text{for } k = 1, \ldots, n. \tag{10}$$

Therefore $l_j(t) \le L_j(t)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 2n$, and $\begin{bmatrix} \int_0^\infty l_{2n-1}(t)dt \\ \int_0^\infty l_{2n}(t)dt \end{bmatrix} \le \begin{bmatrix} \int_0^\infty L_{2n-1}(t)dt \\ \int_0^\infty L_{2n}(t)dt \end{bmatrix}$. Then it is sufficient to show that $\begin{bmatrix} \int_0^\infty L_{2n-1}(t)dt \\ \int_0^\infty L_{2n}(t)dt \end{bmatrix} < \infty$.

With the same initial value as in (10), from the explicit recursive solution (4), one can easily check by induction that for each $t \ge 0$, $L_{2k-1}(t)$ and $L_{2k}(t)$ are increasing with k. Hence we can define non-negative distance functions

$$\begin{aligned} k = 1: &\qquad d_1^{(1)}(t) := L_1(t), \quad d_1^{(2)}(t) := L_2(t). \\ k \ge 2: &\qquad d_k^{(1)}(t) := L_{2k-1}(t) - L_{2k-3}(t), \quad d_k^{(2)}(t) := L_{2k}(t) - L_{2k-2}(t). \end{aligned}$$

The following inequalities hold and are proven in Section A.3:

$$\begin{aligned} d_{k+1}^{(1)}(t) &\le e^{-\delta_2 t} \int_0^t e^{\delta_2 s}\left[\mu_{G^{2,2}} d_k^{(1)}(s) + \mu_{G^{1,2}} d_k^{(2)}(s)\right] ds, \\ d_{k+1}^{(2)}(t) &\le e^{-\delta_1 t} \int_0^t e^{\delta_1 s}\left[\mu_{G^{2,1}} d_k^{(1)}(s) + \mu_{G^{1,1}} d_k^{(2)}(s)\right] ds. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty d_{i+1}^{(1)}(t)dt &\leq \int_{t=0}^\infty e^{-\delta_2 t}\int_{s=0}^t e^{\delta_2 s}\left(\mu_{G^{2,2}}d_i^{(1)}(s)+\mu_{G^{1,2}}d_i^{(2)}(s)\right)ds\\ &= \int_{s=0}^\infty\left(\int_{t=s}^\infty e^{-\delta_2 t}dt\right)e^{\delta_2 s}\left(\mu_{G^{2,2}}d_i^{(1)}(s)+\mu_{G^{1,2}}d_i^{(2)}(s)\right)ds\\ &= \frac{\mu_{G^{2,2}}}{\delta_2}\int_0^\infty d_i^{(1)}(s)ds+\frac{\mu_{G^{1,2}}}{\delta_2}\int_0^\infty d_i^{(2)}(s)ds.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\int_0^\infty d_{i+1}^{(2)}(t)dt \leq \frac{\mu_{G^{2,1}}}{\delta_1}\int_0^\infty d_i^{(1)}(s)ds+\frac{\mu_{G^{1,1}}}{\delta_1}\int_0^\infty d_i^{(2)}(s)ds.$$

i.e.

$$\begin{bmatrix}\int_0^\infty d_{i+1}^{(1)}(t)dt\\ \int_0^\infty d_{i+1}^{(2)}(t)dt\end{bmatrix}\leq A\begin{bmatrix}\int_0^\infty d_i^{(1)}(t)dt\\ \int_0^\infty d_i^{(2)}(t)dt\end{bmatrix},\quad \text{with } A:=\begin{bmatrix}\frac{\mu_{G^{2,2}}}{\delta_2} & \frac{\mu_{G^{1,2}}}{\delta_2}\\ \frac{\mu_{G^{2,1}}}{\delta_1} & \frac{\mu_{G^{1,1}}}{\delta_1}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Iteratively, we obtain for $i\geq 1$,

$$\begin{bmatrix}\int_0^\infty d_i^{(1)}(t)dt\\ \int_0^\infty d_i^{(2)}(t)dt\end{bmatrix}\leq A^{i-1}\begin{bmatrix}\int_0^\infty d_1^{(1)}(t)dt\\ \int_0^\infty d_1^{(2)}(t)dt\end{bmatrix}=A^{i-1}\begin{bmatrix}\frac{v_2^*}{\delta_2}\\ \frac{v_1^*}{\delta_1}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Denote the spectral radius of A as ρ. From the matrix theory, for any $\epsilon>0$, and denote $\tilde{\rho}:=\rho+\epsilon$, there exists a norm $\|\cdot\|$, such that $\|A\|\leq\tilde{\rho}$. Then, for any $i\geq 1$,

$$\|A^i\|\leq\|A\|^i\leq\tilde{\rho}^i.$$

Moreover, take the Euclidean norm and due to the equivalence of norm, there exists a constant $C>0$, such that

$$\|A^i\|_2\leq C\|A^i\|\leq C\tilde{\rho}^i.$$

By definition, $L_{2n-1}(t)=\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{(1)}(t)$ and $L_{2n}(t)=\sum_{i=1}^n d_i^{(2)}(t)$, then

$$\begin{bmatrix}\int_0^\infty L_{2n-1}(t)dt\\ \int_0^\infty L_{2n}(t)dt\end{bmatrix}=\sum_{i=1}^n\begin{bmatrix}\int_0^\infty d_i^{(1)}(t)dt\\ \int_0^\infty d_i^{(2)}(t)dt\end{bmatrix}\leq\left(\sum_{i=1}^n A^{i-1}\right)\begin{bmatrix}\frac{v_2^*}{\delta_2}\\ \frac{v_1^*}{\delta_1}\end{bmatrix}.$$

Denote $\tilde{L}_n:=\left\|\begin{bmatrix}\int_0^\infty L_{2n-1}(t)dt\\ \int_0^\infty L_{2n}(t)dt\end{bmatrix}\right\|_2$, then

$$\tilde{L}_n\leq\sum_{i=1}^n\|A^{i-1}\|_2\left\|\begin{bmatrix}\frac{v_2^*}{\delta_2}\\ \frac{v_1^*}{\delta_1}\end{bmatrix}\right\|_2\leq C\frac{1-\tilde{\rho}^n}{1-\tilde{\rho}}\sqrt{\left(\frac{v_2^*}{\delta_2}\right)^2+\left(\frac{v_1^*}{\delta_1}\right)^2}<\infty.$$

Hence $\int_0^\infty L_{2n-1}(t)dt\leq\tilde{L}_n<\infty$ and $\int_0^\infty L_{2n}(t)dt\leq\tilde{L}_n<\infty$, which indicates π_A^m exists.

The existence of the limiting distribution μ_A^n of $(\lambda^{1,n},\lambda^{2,n})$ is indicated from the analysis above. Indeed, by taking $v_{2i-1}=v_1$ and $v_{2i}=v_2$ for $i=1,\ldots,n$, then the Laplace transform in (7) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}_A^n(v_1,v_2)&:=\lim_{T\to\infty}\mathbb{E}_0\left[e^{-v_1\lambda_T^{1,n}-v_2\lambda_T^{2,n}}\right]\\ &=\exp\left(-\rho_1\int_0^\infty\left[1-\hat{h}_1(l_{2n}(t))\right]dt-\rho_2\int_0^\infty\left[1-\hat{h}_2(l_{2n-1}(t))\right]dt\right),\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

where $l_{2n-1}(t)$, $l_{2n}(t)$ are from the solution of the ODE system (4) with initial values $l_{2i-1}(0) = v_1$ and $l_{2i}(0) \equiv v_2$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

In this case, $l_j(t) = L_j(t)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$, and therefore the limiting distribution μ_A^n exists.

(2) We explore the existence condition of the limiting distribution μ_A^* of (λ^1, λ^2) using the convergence from μ_A^n.

Note that for the Laplace transform $\hat{\mu}_A^n$ in (12), $l_{2n}(t)$ and $l_{2n-1}(t)$ are from the explicit solution to (4). That is, for $k = 0, \ldots, n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned} l_1(t) &= v_2 e^{-\delta_2 t}, \quad l_2(t) = v_1 e^{-\delta_1 t} \\ l_{2k+1}(t) &= v_2 e^{-\delta_2 t} + e^{-\delta_2 t} \int_0^t e^{\delta_2 s} \left[1 - \hat{g}_{1,2}(l_{2k}(s)) + 1 - \hat{g}_{2,2}(l_{2k-1}(s))\right] ds \\ l_{2k+2}(t) &= v_1 e^{-\delta_1 t} + e^{-\delta_1 t} \int_0^t e^{\delta_1 s} \left[1 - \hat{g}_{1,1}(l_{2k}(s)) + 1 - \hat{g}_{2,1}(l_{2k-1}(s))\right] ds. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Note that $l_{2k-1}(t)$ and $l_{2k}(t)$ are increasing functions of k for all k and $t \geq 0$, hence by the monotone convergence theorem, $(l_{2n-1}(t), l_{2n}(t))$ converges to a limit $(l_1^*(t), l_2^*(t))$.

The Laplace transform of the limiting distribution of $(\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2)$ is

$$\hat{\mu}_A^*(v_1, v_2) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{\mu}_A^n(v_1, v_2) = \exp\left(-\rho_1 \int_0^\infty \left[1 - \hat{h}_1(l_2^*(t))\right] dt - \rho_2 \int_0^\infty \left[1 - \hat{h}_2(l_1^*(t))\right] dt\right). \tag{14}$$

To show μ_A^* is non-degenerate, following the same argument as in (8), it is sufficient to have $\begin{bmatrix} \int_0^\infty l_1^*(t)dt \\ \int_0^\infty l_2^*(t)dt \end{bmatrix} < \infty$.

Under $(C2)$ in Condition 3.1 and the matrix theory, take $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1-\rho}{2}$, there exists a norm $\|\cdot\|$, such that $\|A\| \leq \tilde{\rho} = \rho + \epsilon < 1$, then from the first part of the proof,

$$\tilde{L}_n \leq C \frac{1 - \tilde{\rho}^n}{1 - \tilde{\rho}} \sqrt{\left(\frac{v_2}{\delta_2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{v_1}{\delta_1}\right)^2} < C \frac{1}{1 - \tilde{\rho}} \sqrt{\left(\frac{v_2}{\delta_2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{v_1}{\delta_1}\right)^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{bmatrix} \int_0^\infty l_1^*(t)dt \\ \int_0^\infty l_2^*(t)dt \end{bmatrix} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \begin{bmatrix} \int_0^\infty l_{2n-1}(t)dt \\ \int_0^\infty l_{2n}(t)dt \end{bmatrix} < \infty.$$

□

4 Stationary Distribution

The limiting distributions of the finite system and BDCP exist by Theorem 3.4. In this part, we show the equivalence between the stationary distribution and the limiting distribution.

First, a stationarity condition for the finite system $\left(\Lambda_t^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda_t^{(m)}\right)$ is provided.

Lemma 4.1 (Stationary condition equation for the finite system)**.**
Distribution π_S^m is a stationary distribution of $(\Lambda_t^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda_t^{(m)})$ if and only if the Laplace

transform $\hat{\pi}_S^m$ *at any* $(v_1, \ldots, v_m) \in \mathbb{R}_+^m$ *satisfies*

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -\sum_{k=1}^{m} \delta_k v_k \hat{\pi}^m(v_1, \ldots, v_m) + \rho_1(\hat{h}(v_1) - 1) + \rho_2(\hat{h}(v_2) - 1) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial \hat{\pi}^m(v_1, \ldots, v_m)}{\partial v_{2k-1}} \left[(1 - \hat{g}_{1,1}(v_{2k+1})) + (1 - \hat{g}_{2,1}(v_{2k+2}))\right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{\partial \hat{\pi}^m(v_1, \ldots, v_m)}{\partial v_{2k}} \left[(1 - \hat{g}_{1,2}(v_{2k+1})) + (1 - \hat{g}_{2,2}(v_{2k+2}))\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Equivalently, in terms of ODE system (4) as

$$0 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \dot{l}_{2(n-k)+2}(0) \frac{\partial \hat{\pi}_S^m}{\partial v_{2k-1}} + \dot{l}_{2(n-k)+1}(0) \frac{\partial \hat{\pi}_S^m}{\partial v_{2k}} - \rho_1(1 - \hat{h}_1(v_1))\hat{\pi}_S^m - \rho_2(1 - \hat{h}_2(v_2))\hat{\pi}_S^m. \tag{15}$$

Proof. The proof is based on Markov theory as in (2) and details can be found in Section A.2. □

The following theorem states the equivalence between the limiting and stationary distribution.

Theorem 4.2 (Stationarity of the finite system)**.**
For any system index $m = 2n$ *for* $\left(\Lambda_t^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda_t^{(m)}\right)$*, if there exits a limiting distribution* π_A^m*, then there exits a unique stationary distribution* π_S^m *and* $\pi_S^m \overset{d}{=} \pi_A^m$*.*

Proof. For the existence, it is sufficient to show that $\hat{\pi}^m := \hat{\pi}_A^m$ satisfies the condition equation (15). The uniqueness of such π_S^m follows from the uniqueness of π_A^m.

Since $\lim_{t\to\infty} l_{2n}(t) = \lim_{t\to\infty} l_{2n-1}(t) = 0$ from Lemma 3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{\pi}^m}{\partial v_{2k-1}} &= \hat{\pi}^m \left[\rho_1 \int_0^\infty \hat{h}_1'(l_{2n}(t)) \frac{\partial l_{2n}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}} dt + \rho_2 \int_0^\infty \hat{h}_2'(l_{2n-1}(t)) \frac{\partial l_{2n-1}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}} dt\right] \\ \frac{\partial \hat{\pi}^m}{\partial v_{2k}} &= \hat{\pi}^m \left[\rho_1 \int_0^\infty \hat{h}_1'(l_{2n}(t)) \frac{\partial l_{2n}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}} dt + \rho_2 \int_0^\infty \hat{h}_2'(l_{2n-1}(t)) \frac{\partial l_{2n-1}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}} dt\right] \\ 1 - \hat{h}_1(v_1) &= \int_0^\infty \hat{h}_1'(l_{2n}(t)) \dot{l}_{2n}(t) dt \\ 1 - \hat{h}_2(v_2) &= \int_0^\infty \hat{h}_2'(l_{2n-1}(t)) \dot{l}_{2n-1}(t) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Then, the stationarity equation (15) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \rho_1 \int_0^\infty \hat{h}_1'(l_{2n}(t)) \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\dot{l}_{2(n-k)+2}(0) \frac{\partial l_{2n}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}} + \dot{l}_{2(n-k)+1}(0) \frac{\partial l_{2n}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}}\right) - \dot{l}_{2n}(t)\right] dt \\ &\quad + \rho_2 \int_0^\infty \hat{h}_2'(l_{2n-1}(t)) \left[\sum_{k=1}^{n} \left(\dot{l}_{2(n-k)+2}(0) \frac{\partial l_{2n-1}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}} + \dot{l}_{2(n-k)+1}(0) \frac{\partial l_{2n-1}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}}\right) - \dot{l}_{2n-1}(t)\right] dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since the functions l_k is independent from the choice of $\hat{h}_i$ and ρ_i for $i = 1, 2$, for system

index $m = 2n$, re-denote $l_k(\cdot)$ as $l_k^{2n}(\cdot)$, then it is sufficient to show:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\dot{l}^{2n}_{2(n-k)+2}(0)\frac{\partial l^{2n}_{2n}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}}+\dot{l}^{2n}_{2(n-k)+1}(0)\frac{\partial l^{2n}_{2n}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}}\right)-\dot{l}^{2n}_{2n}(t) &= 0,\\ \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\dot{l}^{2n}_{2(n-k)+2}(0)\frac{\partial l^{2n}_{2n-1}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}}+\dot{l}^{2n}_{2(n-k)+1}(0)\frac{\partial l^{2n}_{2n-1}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}}\right)-\dot{l}^{2n}_{2n-1}(t) &= 0.\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

By observing the self-similarity in the system structure, we prove (16) using the induction with respect to the system index $m = 2n$.

(1) For $n = 1$, it is easy to observe that $l_1^2(t) = v_2e^{-\delta_2 t}$ and $l_2^2(t) = v_1e^{-\delta_1 t}$ satisfies (16).

(2) Assume that $m = 2n$ satisfies (16), we show that for $m = 2(n + 1)$ also satisfies (16). One needs to show the first equation as follows and the second follows in the same way. I.e.,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n+1}\left[\dot{l}^{2(n+1)}_{2(n+1-k)+2}(0)\frac{\partial l^{2(n+1)}_{2n+2}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}}+\dot{l}^{2(n+1)}_{2(n+1-k)+1}(0)\frac{\partial l^{2(n+1)}_{2n+2}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}}\right]-\dot{l}^{2(n+1)}_{2n+2}(t) = 0, \tag{17}$$

where $l^{2(n+1)}_{2(n+1)-i+1}(0) = v_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 2n$.

Note that from the ODE system and the recursive solution, we have

$$l^{2(n+1)}_{2(n+1)}(0) = v_1, \quad \frac{\partial l^{2(n+1)}_{2(n+1)}(t)}{\partial v_1} = e^{-\delta_1 t}, \quad \frac{\partial l^{2(n+1)}_{2(n+1)}(t)}{\partial v_2} = 0.$$

Then, the $k = 1$ term in (17) becomes $\dot{l}^{2(n+1)}_{2n+2}(0)e^{-\delta_1 t}$. Hence, we need to show that

$$\sum_{k=2}^{n+1}\left[\dot{l}^{2(n+1)}_{2(n+1-k)+2}(0)\frac{\partial l^{2(n+1)}_{2n+2}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}}+\dot{l}^{2(n+1)}_{2(n+1-k)+1}(0)\frac{\partial l^{2(n+1)}_{2n+2}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}}\right] = \dot{l}^{2(n+1)}_{2n+2}(t)-e^{-\delta_1 t}\dot{l}^{2(n+1)}_{2n+2}(0).$$

As (16) holds for $m = 2n$ for all $(v_1, \ldots, v_{2n}) \in \mathbb{R}^m_+$, one can construct functions $\{L_i^{2n}(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^{2n}$, such that they satisfies (16) with initial values

$$(\tilde{v}_1, \ldots, \tilde{v}_{2n}) = (v_3, \ldots, v_{2n+2}).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\dot{L}^{2n}_{2(n-k)+2}(0)\frac{\partial L^{2n}_{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-1}}+\dot{L}^{2n}_{2(n-k)+1}(0)\frac{\partial L^{2n}_{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k}}\right)-\dot{L}^{2n}_{2n}(t) &= 0\\ \sum_{k=1}^{n}\left(\dot{L}^{2n}_{2(n-k)+2}(0)\frac{\partial L^{2n}_{2n-1}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-1}}+\dot{L}^{2n}_{2(n-k)+1}(0)\frac{\partial L^{2n}_{2n-1}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k}}\right)-\dot{L}^{2n}_{2n-1}(t) &= 0.\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

with $L^{2n}_{2n-i+1}(0) = \tilde{v}_i = v_{i+2}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 2n$. Especially $L_1^{2n}(0) = v_{2n+2}$ and $L_2^{2n}(0) = v_{2n+1}$.

By construction construction, for $k = 1, \ldots, n$, $t \geq 0$,

$$l^{2(n+1)}_{2k-1}(t) = L^{2n}_{2k-1}(t), \quad l^{2(n+1)}_{2k}(t) = L^{2n}_{2k}(t),$$

and

$$\frac{\partial l_{2n}^{2(n+1)}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}} = \frac{\partial L_{2n}^{2n}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}} = \frac{\partial L_{2n}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-3}}, \quad \frac{\partial l_{2n}^{2(n+1)}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}} = \frac{\partial L_{2n}^{2n}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}} = \frac{\partial L_{2n}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-2}}.$$

For terms with $k \geq 2$ in in (17),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=2}^{n+1}\left[i_{2(n+1-k)+2}^{2(n+1)}(0)\frac{\partial l_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(t)}{\partial v_{2k-1}} + i_{2(n+1-k)+1}^{2(n+1)}(0)\frac{\partial l_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(t)}{\partial v_{2k}}\right] \\
= & -\int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\hat{g}'_{1,1}\left(L_{2n}^{2n}(s)\right)\sum_{k=2}^{n+1}\left[\dot{L}_{2(n+1-k)+2}^{2n}(0)\frac{\partial L_{2n}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-3}} + \dot{L}_{2(n+1-k)+1}^{2n}(0)\frac{\partial L_{2n}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-2}}\right]ds \\
& -\int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\hat{g}'_{2,1}\left(L_{2n-1}^{2n}(s)\right)\sum_{k=2}^{n+1}\left[\dot{L}_{2(n+1-k)+2}^{2n}(0)\frac{\partial L_{2n-1}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-3}} + \dot{L}_{2(n+1-k)+1}^{2n}(0)\frac{\partial L_{2n-1}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-2}}\right]ds \\
= & -\int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\hat{g}'_{1,1}\left(L_{2n}^{2n}(s)\right)\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left[\dot{L}_{2(n-k)+2}^{2n}(0)\frac{\partial L_{2n}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-1}} + \dot{L}_{2(n-k)+1}^{2n}(0)\frac{\partial L_{2n}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k}}\right]ds \\
& -\int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\hat{g}'_{2,1}\left(L_{2n-1}^{2n}(s)\right)\sum_{k=1}^{n}\left[\dot{L}_{2(n-k)+2}^{2n}(0)\frac{\partial L_{2n-1}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k-1}} + \dot{L}_{2(n-k)+1}^{2n}(0)\frac{\partial L_{2n-1}^{2n}(t)}{\partial \tilde{v}_{2k}}\right]ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

By (18), (19) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\hat{g}'_{1,1}\left(L_{2n}^{2n}(s)\right)\dot{L}_{2n}^{2n}(s)ds - \int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\hat{g}'_{2,1}\left(L_{2n-1}^{2n}(s)\right)\dot{L}_{2n-1}^{2n}(s)ds \\
= & \int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\left[1-\hat{g}_{1,1}\left(L_{2n}^{2n}(s)\right)+1-\hat{g}_{2,1}\left(L_{2n-1}^{2n}(s)\right)\right]ds \\
= & \int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\left[1-\hat{g}_{1,1}\left(l_{2n}^{2(n+1)}(s)\right)+1-\hat{g}_{2,1}\left(l_{2n-1}^{2(n+1)}(s)\right)\right]ds \\
\overset{(4)}{=} & \int_0^t e^{-\delta_1(t-s)}\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\left[i_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(s)+\delta_1 l_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(s)\right]ds
\end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$F(s) := e^{\delta_1 s} l_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(s),$$

then $\dot{F}(s) = e^{\delta_1 s}\left(i_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(s)+\delta_1 l_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(s)\right)$, and $\dot{F}(0) = i_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(0)+\delta_1 v_1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(19) &= e^{-\delta_1 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_1 s} d\left(e^{-\delta_1 s}\dot{F}(s)\right) \\
&= e^{-\delta_1 t}\left(\dot{F}(t)-\dot{F}(0)\right)-\delta_1 e^{-\delta_1 t}\left(F(t)-F(0)\right) \\
&= \left(i_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(t)+\delta_1 l_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(t)\right)-e^{-\delta_1 t}\left(i_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(0)+\delta_1 v_1\right)-\delta_1 e^{-\delta_1 t}\left(e^{\delta_1 t} l_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(t)-v_1\right) \\
&= l_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(t)-e^{-\delta_1 t} i_{2n+2}^{2(n+1)}(0).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Hence, by Theorem 4.2 and Theorem 3.4, we can conclude that for the finite system $\left(\Lambda_t^{(1)},\ldots,\Lambda_t^{(m)}\right)$, there exists a unique stationary distribution that is equal to the limiting distribution.

Corollary 4.3. *There exists a unique stationary distribution μ_S^n of $\left(\lambda_t^{1,n}, \lambda_t^{2,n}\right)$, and it is equal to the limiting distribution μ_A^n with the Laplace transform (12).*

Proof. The joint distribution of $\left(\lambda_t^{1,n}, \lambda_t^{2,n}\right)$ at any $t \geq 0$, $k \geq 0$ and $0 \leq s_1 \leq \ldots \leq s_k$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_{t+s_1}^{1,n} \leq x_1^1, \lambda_{t+s_1}^{2,n} \leq x_1^2; \ldots; \lambda_{t+s_k}^{1,n} \leq x_k^1, \lambda_{t+s_k}^{2,n} \leq x_k^2\right) \\
= & \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{t+s_1}^{1,(i)} \leq x_1^1, \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{t+s_1}^{2,(i)} \leq x_1^2; \ldots; \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{t+s_k}^{1,(i)} \leq x_k^1, \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_{t+s_k}^{2,(i)} \leq x_k^2\right) \\
= & \int_{D_1^1} \int_{D_1^2} \cdots \int_{D_k^1} \int_{D_k^2} d\mathbb{P}\left(\lambda_{t+s_1}^{1,(1)} \leq z_1^{1,(1)}, \lambda_{t+s_1}^{2,(1)} \leq z_1^{2,(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_{t+s_k}^{1,(n)} \leq z_k^{1,(n)}, \lambda_{t+s_k}^{2,(n)} \leq z_k^{2,(n)}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where for $j = 1, \ldots, k, j' = 1, 2$, $D_j^{j'} = \left\{\left(z_j^{j',(1)}, \ldots, z_j^{j',(n)}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i=1}^n z_j^{j',(i)} \leq x_j^{j'}\right\}$.

By Theorem 4.2, take the distribution of $\left(\lambda_t^{1,(1)}, \lambda_t^{2,(1)}, \ldots, \lambda_t^{1,(n)}, \lambda_t^{2,(n)}\right) = \left(\Lambda^{(1)}, \ldots, \Lambda^{(m)}\right)$ as the unique stationary distribution π_S^m, then the joint distribution above is independent of t. Hence from the equation above, the distribution $\left(\lambda_{t+s_1}^{1,n}, \lambda_{t+s_1}^{2,n}; \ldots; \lambda_{t+s_k}^{1,n}, \lambda_{t+s_k}^{2,n}\right)$ is also independent of t. Therefore by definition $\left(\lambda_t^{1,n}, \lambda_t^{2,n}\right)$ is a stationary process.

Since the limiting distribution exits and independent from the initial condition, then $\mu_S^n \stackrel{d}{=} \mu_A^n$ and the uniqueness follows. □

Now we present the existence and uniqueness of stationary distribution for $(\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2)$ which is the main result of this paper.

Theorem 4.4 (Existence of Stationary Distribution)**.** *Under (C1) and (C2), there exists a unique stationary distribution μ_S^* for the BDCP intensity $\left(\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2\right)$, and moreover $\mu_S^* \stackrel{d}{=} \mu_A^*$.*

Proof. Let $(\lambda^{1,n}, \lambda^{2,n})$ starts from the stationary distribution μ_S^n, then for any $t \geq 0$, $0 \leq s_1 \leq \ldots \leq s_k$,

$$\left(\lambda_{t+s_1}^{1,n}, \lambda_{t+s_1}^{2,n}; \ldots; \lambda_{t+s_k}^{1,n}, \lambda_{t+s_k}^{2,n}\right) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\lambda_{s_1}^{1,n}, \lambda_{s_1}^{2,n}; \ldots; \lambda_{s_k}^{1,n}, \lambda_{s_k}^{2,n}\right). \tag{20}$$

Since $\left(\lambda_t^{1,n}, \lambda_t^{2,n}\right)$ converges to $\left(\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2\right)$ pathwise implying the convergence of finite dimensional distribution. As $n \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\lambda_{t+s_1}^{1,n}, \lambda_{t+s_1}^{2,n}; \ldots; \lambda_{t+s_k}^{1,n}, \lambda_{t+s_k}^{2,n}\right) & \Rightarrow \left(\lambda_{t+s_1}^1, \lambda_{t+s_1}^2; \ldots; \lambda_{t+s_k}^1, \lambda_{t+s_k}^2\right), \quad n \to \infty, \\
\left(\lambda_{s_1}^{1,n}, \lambda_{s_1}^{2,n}; \ldots; \lambda_{s_k}^{1,n}, \lambda_{s_k}^{2,n}\right) & \Rightarrow \left(\lambda_{s_1}^1, \lambda_{s_1}^2; \ldots; \lambda_{s_k}^1, \lambda_{s_k}^2\right), \quad n \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

where the left land side distribution is π_S^m.

By (20) and uniqueness of the weak limit, we have the limiting process

$$\left(\lambda_{t+s_1}^1, \lambda_{t+s_1}^2; \ldots; \lambda_{t+s_k}^1, \lambda_{t+s_k}^2\right) \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\lambda_{s_1}^1, \lambda_{s_1}^2; \ldots; \lambda_{s_k}^1, \lambda_{s_k}^2\right).$$

i.e. the finite dimensional distribution is independent of t. Hence (λ^1, λ^2) has a stationary distribution μ_S^*.

Since the limiting distribution μ_A^* exists and is independent with the initial value, then $\mu_S^* \stackrel{d}{=} \mu_A^*$. As μ_A^* is unique, the uniqueness of μ_S^* follows.

□

Remark 4.5. *Note that the Theorem 7 in Brémaud and Massoulié[7] has a similar result that is a special case of ours and the result can be recovered by* $(C1)$ *for the bivariate case.*

Remark 4.6. *From the analysis above, besides the BDCP system* (λ^1, λ^2)*, we also provide the distribution of non-stationary and stationary version of* $(\lambda^{1,n}, \lambda^{2,n})$ *in terms of Laplace transform. Note that as one can choose the extent of the contagion effect for the modelling purpose using the finite system* $(\lambda^{1,n}, \lambda^{2,n})$*. Therefore, it is an interesting process itself for applications and further analysis.*

For any $h > 0$, $N_{t_1+h} - N_{t_1}|_{\lambda_{t_1}=\lambda} \stackrel{d}{=} N_{t_2+h} - N_{t_2}|_{\lambda_{t_2}=\lambda}$. If λ_t is stationary, then $\lambda_{t_1} \stackrel{d}{=} \lambda_{t_2}$, and $N_{t_1+h} - N_{t_1} \stackrel{d}{=} N_{t_2+h} - N_{t_2}$. Hence we have the following results:

Corollary 4.7. *The BDCP* N *has stationary increments on* $\mathbb{R}_+$*.*

5 Stationary Moments

From Theorem 4.4, $(\lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2)$ has a unique stationary distribution μ_S^*. By Proposition 9.2, Chapter 4 in Ethier and Kurtz [19], for any $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, we have

$$\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathcal{A}f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)\mu_S^*(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)d\lambda_1 d\lambda_2 = 0. \tag{21}$$

In the following, we will use (21) to derive stationary mean, variance and correlation.

5.1 Stationary Mean

Take $\mathcal{A}f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \lambda_i$ and denote $m_1^i = \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^i]$ as the stationary mean, we have

$$\begin{aligned} -(\delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}})m_1^1 + \mu_{G^{1,2}}m_1^2 + \rho_1\mu_{H^1} &= 0 \\ -(\delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}})m_1^2 + \mu_{G^{2,1}}m_1^1 + \rho_2\mu_{H^2} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Solving this linear equation system we obtain the stationary mean as

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^1 &= \frac{(\delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}})\mu_{H^1}}{(\delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}})(\delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}}) - \mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}}\rho_1 + \frac{\mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{H^2}}{(\delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}})(\delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}}) - \mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}}\rho_2 \\ m_1^2 &= \frac{(\delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}})\mu_{H^2}}{(\delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}})(\delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}}) - \mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}}\rho_2 + \frac{\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{H^1}}{(\delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}})(\delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}}) - \mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}}\rho_1. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\Delta_i = \delta_i - \mu_{G^{i,i}}$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $\Delta := \Delta_1\Delta_2 - \mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}$, then we can rewrite the first moments as

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^1 &= \frac{\Delta_2\mu_{H^1}}{\Delta}\rho_1 + \frac{\mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{H^2}}{\Delta}\rho_2 =: \mu_{1,1}\rho_1 + \mu_{1,2}\rho_2 \\ m_1^2 &= \frac{\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{H^1}}{\Delta}\rho_1 + \frac{\Delta_1\mu_{H^2}}{\Delta}\rho_2 =: \mu_{2,1}\rho_1 + \mu_{2,2}\rho_2. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.1. *If there is no cross-exciting term, i.e.* $\mu_{G^{i,j}} = 0$ *for* $i \neq j$*, then the result recovers univariate DCP in Dassios and Zhao[13].*

X	$X_{1,1}$	$X_{2,2}$	$X_{1,2}$	X_1	X_2	X_0
A	$-2\Delta_1$	0	$2\mu_{G^{1,2}}$	$2\mu_{H^1}\rho_1 + \mu_{2G^{1,1}}$	$\mu_{2G^{1,2}}$	$\mu_{2H^1}\rho_1$
B	0	$-2\Delta_2$	$2\mu_{G^{2,1}}$	$\mu_{2G^{2,1}}$	$2\mu_{H^2}\rho_2 + \mu_{2G^{2,2}}$	$\mu_{2H^2}\rho_2$
C	$\mu_{G^{2,1}}$	$\mu_{G^{1,2}}$	$-\Delta_1 - \Delta_2$	$\mu_{H^2}\rho_2 + \mu_{G^{1,1}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}$	$\mu_{H^1}\rho_1 + \mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,2}}$	0

Table 1: coefficient table for A, B, C, $\Delta_1 = \delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}} > 0$ and $\Delta_2 = \delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}} > 0$.

5.2 Stationary Variance

We consider the stationary moments of $(\lambda_t^1)^2$, $(\lambda_t^2)^2$ and $\lambda_t^1\lambda_t^2$.

Take $f(t, \lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2) = (\lambda_t^1)^2$ and $f(t, \lambda_t^1, \lambda_t^2) = (\lambda_t^2)^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\lambda_1^2) &= -2\delta_1\lambda_1^2 + \rho_1\left[\int_0^\infty (\lambda_1 + y_1)^2 H^1(dy_1) - \lambda_1^2\right] \\
&\quad + \lambda_1\left[\int_0^\infty (\lambda_1 + z_1)^2 G^{1,1}(dz_1) - \lambda_1^2\right] + \lambda_2\left[\int_0^\infty (\lambda_1 + z_1)^2 G^{1,2}(dz_1) - \lambda_1^2\right] \\
&= -2\delta_1\lambda_1^2 + \rho_1(2\lambda_1\mu_{H^1} + \mu_{2H^1}) + \lambda_1(2\lambda_1\mu_{G^{1,1}} + \mu_{2G^{1,1}}) + \lambda_2(2\lambda_1\mu_{G^{1,2}} + \mu_{2G^{1,2}}) \\
&= -2(\delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}})\lambda_1^2 + 2\mu_{G^{1,2}}\lambda_1\lambda_2 + (2\rho_1\mu_{H^1} + \mu_{2G^{1,1}})\lambda_1 + \mu_{2G^{1,2}}\lambda_2 + \mu_{2H^1}\rho_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\lambda_2^2) &= -2(\delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}})\lambda_2^2 + 2\mu_{G^{2,1}}\lambda_1\lambda_2 + (2\rho_2\mu_{H^2} + \mu_{2G^{2,2}})\lambda_2 + \mu_{2G^{2,1}}\lambda_1 + \mu_{2H^2}\rho_2 \\
\mathcal{A}\lambda_1\lambda_2 &= -(\delta_1 + \delta_2)\lambda_1\lambda_2 + \rho_1\lambda_2\mu_{H^1} + \rho_2\lambda_1\mu_{H^2} + \lambda_1\left(\lambda_1\mu_{G^{2,1}} + \lambda_2\mu_{G^{1,1}} + \mu_{G^{1,1}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}\right) \\
&\quad + \lambda_2(\lambda_1\mu_{G^{2,2}} + \lambda_2\mu_{G^{1,2}} + \mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,2}}) \\
&= \mu_{G^{2,1}}\lambda_1^2 + \mu_{G^{1,2}}\lambda_2^2 + \left(-(\delta_1 - \mu_{G^{1,1}}) - (\delta_2 - \mu_{G^{2,2}})\right)\lambda_1\lambda_2 \\
&\quad + (\rho_2\mu_{H^2} + \mu_{G^{1,1}}\mu_{G^{2,1}})\lambda_1 + (\rho_1\mu_{H^1} + \mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,2}})\lambda_2.
\end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(\lambda_1^2) &=: A_{1,1}\lambda_1^2 + A_{1,2}\lambda_1\lambda_2 + A_1\lambda_1 + A_2\lambda_2 + A_0 \\
\mathcal{A}(\lambda_2^2) &=: B_{2,2}\lambda_2^2 + B_{1,2}\lambda_1\lambda_2 + B_2\lambda_2 + B_1\lambda_1 + B_0 \\
\mathcal{A}\lambda_1\lambda_2 &=: C_{1,1}\lambda_1^2 + C_{2,2}\lambda_2^2 + C_{1,2}\lambda_1\lambda_2 + C_1\lambda_1 + C_2\lambda_2.
\end{aligned}$$

with all coefficients in Table 5.2. Note that $A_{i,j}, B_{i,j}, C_{i,j}$ do not contain ρ and A_1, B_2, C_1, C_2 are linear with ρ.

We denote

$$\begin{aligned}
m_2^i &=: \mathbb{E}[(\lambda_t^i)^2] \\
m_2^{i,j} &=: \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^i\lambda_t^j],
\end{aligned}$$

then by (21) we obtain the linear equation system:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{1,1}m_2^1 + A_{1,2}m_2^{1,2} + \left(A_1m_1^1 + A_2m_1^2 + A_0\right) &= 0 \\
B_{2,2}m_2^2 + B_{1,2}m_2^{1,2} + \left(B_2m_1^2 + B_1m_1^1 + B_0\right) &= 0 \\
C_{1,1}m_2^1 + C_{2,2}m_2^2 + C_{1,2}m_2^{1,2} + \left(C_1m_1^1 + C_2m_1^2\right) &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the cross term is

$$m_2^{1,2} = -\frac{C_1m_1^1 + C_2m_1^2 + C_{1,1}m_2^1 + C_{2,2}m_2^2}{C_{1,2}}. \tag{22}$$

Based on the first moments m_1^1, m_1^2 obtained in the last section, we obtain the second moments m_2^1 and m_2^2 by solving the linear equation system.

$$\begin{aligned}\left(A_{1,1}-A_{1,2}\frac{C_{1,1}}{C_{1,2}}\right)m_2^1-A_{1,2}\frac{C_{2,2}}{C_{1,2}}m_2^2+\left(\tilde{A}_0-\frac{A_{1,2}}{C_{1,2}}\tilde{C}_0\right) &= 0\\ \left(B_{2,2}-B_{1,2}\frac{C_{2,2}}{C_{1,2}}\right)m_2^2-B_{1,2}\frac{C_{1,1}}{C_{1,2}}m_2^1+\left(\tilde{B}_0-\frac{B_{1,2}}{C_{1,2}}\tilde{C}_0\right) &= 0,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{A}_0 &= A_1m_1^1+A_2m_1^2+A_0\\ \tilde{B}_0 &= B_2m_1^2+B_1m_1^1+B_0\\ \tilde{C}_0 &= C_1m_1^1+C_2m_1^2.\end{aligned}$$

Denote $\gamma_1 := \frac{C_{1,1}}{C_{1,2}}$ and $\gamma_2 := \frac{C_{2,2}}{C_{1,2}}$, then

$$\left[A_{1,1}-A_{1,2}\gamma_1-\frac{A_{1,2}B_{1,2}\gamma_1\gamma_2}{B_{2,2}-B_{1,2}\gamma_2}\right]m_2^1=-\frac{(\tilde{B}_0-\frac{B_{1,2}}{C_{1,2}}\tilde{C}_0)A_{1,2}\gamma_2}{B_{2,2}-B_{1,2}\gamma_2}-\left(\tilde{A}_0-\frac{A_{1,2}}{C_{1,2}}\tilde{C}_0\right).$$

$$m_2^1 = \frac{-\frac{(\tilde{B}_0-\frac{B_{1,2}}{C_{1,2}}\tilde{C}_0)A_{1,2}\gamma_2}{B_{2,2}-B_{1,2}\gamma_2}-\left(\tilde{A}_0-\frac{A_{1,2}}{C_{1,2}}\tilde{C}_0\right)}{A_{1,1}-A_{1,2}\gamma_1-\frac{A_{1,2}B_{1,2}\gamma_1\gamma_2}{B_{2,2}-B_{1,2}\gamma_2}}=\frac{(B_{1,2}\gamma_2-B_{2,2})\tilde{A}_0-A_{1,2}\gamma_2\tilde{B}_0+\frac{A_{1,2}}{C_{1,2}}B_{2,2}\tilde{C}_0}{4(\Delta_1\Delta_2-\mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,1}})}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$m_2^2 = \frac{-B_{1,2}\gamma_1\tilde{A}_0-(A_{1,1}-A_{1,2}\gamma_1)\tilde{B}_0+\frac{B_{1,2}}{C_{1,2}}A_{1,1}\tilde{C}_0}{4(\Delta_1\Delta_2-\mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,1}})}.$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}m_2^1 &= (m_1^1)^2+\gamma_{1,1}\rho_1+\gamma_{1,2}\rho_2\\ m_2^2 &= (m_1^2)^2+\gamma_{2,1}\rho_1+\gamma_{2,2}\rho_2,\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{1,1} &= \frac{1}{2\Delta}\left(\frac{-2\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{G^{1,2}}}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}+\Delta_2\right)(\mu_{2G^{1,1}}\mu_{1,1}+\mu_{2G^{1,2}}\mu_{2,1}+\mu_{2H^1})\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2\Delta}\frac{(\mu_{G^{1,2}})^2}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}(\mu_{2G^{2,2}}\mu_{2,1}+\mu_{2G^{2,1}}\mu_{1,1})+\frac{1}{\Delta}\frac{\mu_{G^{1,2}}\Delta_2}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}(\mu_{G^{1,1}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{1,1}+\mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,2}}\mu_{2,1})\\ \gamma_{1,2} &= \frac{1}{2\Delta}\left(\frac{-2\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{G^{1,2}}}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}+\Delta_2\right)(\mu_{2G^{1,1}}\mu_{1,2}+\mu_{2G^{1,2}}\mu_{2,2})\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2\Delta}\frac{(\mu_{G^{1,2}})^2}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}(\mu_{2G^{2,2}}\mu_{2,2}+\mu_{2G^{2,1}}\mu_{1,2}+\mu_{2H^2})+\frac{1}{\Delta}\frac{\mu_{G^{1,2}}\Delta_2}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}(\mu_{G^{1,1}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{1,2}+\mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,2}}\mu_{2,2}).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma_{2,1} &= \frac{1}{2\Delta}\left(\frac{-2\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{G^{1,2}}}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}+\Delta_1\right)(\mu_{2G^{2,2}}\mu_{2,1}+\mu_{2G^{2,1}}\mu_{11})\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2\Delta}\frac{(\mu_{G^{2,1}})^2}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}(\mu_{2G^{1,1}}\mu_{1,1}+\mu_{2G^{1,2}}\mu_{2,1}+\mu_{2H^1})+\frac{1}{\Delta}\frac{\mu_{G^{2,1}}\Delta_1}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}(\mu_{G^{1,1}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{1,1}+\mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,2}}\mu_{2,1})\\ \gamma_{2,2} &= \frac{1}{2\Delta}\left(\frac{-2\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{G^{1,2}}}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}+\Delta_1\right)(\mu_{2G^{2,2}}\mu_{2,2}+\mu_{2G^{2,1}}\mu_{1,2}+\mu_{2H^2})\\ &\quad+\frac{1}{2\Delta}\frac{(\mu_{G^{2,1}})^2}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}(\mu_{2G^{1,1}}\mu_{1,2}+\mu_{2G^{1,2}}\mu_{2,2})+\frac{1}{\Delta}\frac{\mu_{G^{2,1}}\Delta_1}{\Delta_1+\Delta_2}(\mu_{G^{1,1}}\mu_{G^{2,1}}\mu_{1,2}+\mu_{G^{1,2}}\mu_{G^{2,2}}\mu_{2,2}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,we conclude the stationary mean and variance are

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &:= \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^1] = \mu_{1,1}\rho_1 + \mu_{1,2}\rho_2 \\ m_2 &:= \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^2] = \mu_{2,1}\rho_1 + \mu_{2,2}\rho_2 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &:= \mathrm{var}(\lambda_t^1) = \gamma_{1,1}\rho_1 + \gamma_{1,2}\rho_2 \\ v_2 &:= \mathrm{var}(\lambda_t^2) = \gamma_{2,1}\rho_1 + \gamma_{2,2}\rho_2 \end{aligned}$$

with coefficients above.

Remark 5.2. *From above, we observe that the stationary mean and variance are both linear functions of ρ_1 and ρ_2.*

5.3 Stationary Correlation

$$\rho_{1,2} = \frac{E[\lambda_t^1\lambda_t^2] - \mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^1]\mathbb{E}[\lambda_t^2]}{\sqrt{\mathrm{var}(\lambda_t^1)}\sqrt{\mathrm{var}(\lambda_t^2)}} = \frac{m_2^{1,2} - m_1 m_2}{\sqrt{v_1}\sqrt{v_2}},$$

where $m_2^{1,2}$ is from (22).

Note that the stationary correlation is larger than processes with only self-exciting jumps as cross-exciting jumps have positive mean $\mu_{G^{1,2}}$ and $\mu_{G^{2,1}}$.

6 Conclusion

By using the the Markov theory on the branching system approximation, we found the condition under which there exists a unique stationary distribution of the BDCP intensity and the resulting BDCP has stationary increments. All moments of the stationary intensity can be computed using the Markov property. Moreover, we also obtained the limiting and stationary distributions of the approximating sequence of the intensity in terms of the Laplace transform which is also useful in practice.

References

[1] Aït-Sahalia, Y., Cacho-Diaz, J. and Laeven, R. J. (2010). Modeling financial contagion using mutually exciting jump processes. *Technical report*. National Bureau of Economic Research.

[2] Albrecher, H. and Asmussen c, S. (2006). Ruin probabilities and aggregrate claims distributions for shot noise Cox processes. *Scandinavian Actuarial Journal* **2006,** 86–110.

[3] Altmann, T., Schmidt, T. and Stute, W. (2008). A shot noise model for financial assets. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance* **11,** 87–106.

[4] Bacry, E., Delattre, S., Hoffmann, M. and Muzy, J.-F. (2013). Modelling microstructure noise with mutually exciting point processes. *Quantitative Finance* **13,** 65–77.

[5] Barczy, M., Döring, L., Li, Z. and Pap, G. (2013). Stationarity and ergodicity for an affine two factor model. *Advances in Applied Probability. Available also on ArXiv: http://arxiv. org/abs/1302.2534*.

[6] Bauwens, L. and Hautsch, N. (2009). Modelling financial high frequency data using point processes. In *Handbook of Financial Time Series*. ed. T. Mikosch, J.-P. Kreiß, R. A. Davis, and T. G. Andersen. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 953–979.

[7] Brémaud, P. and Massoulié, L. (1996). Stability of nonlinear hawkes processes. *The Annals of Probability* **24,** 1563–1588.

[8] Costa, O. (1990). Stationary distributions for piecewise-deterministic markov processes. *Journal of Applied Probability* **27,** 60–73.

[9] Cox, D. R. and Isham, V. (1980). *Point processes* vol. 12 Springer.

[10] Daley, D. J. and Vere-Jones, D. (2002). *An introduction to the theory of point processes* vol. I. Springer.

[11] Dassios, A. and Dong, X. (2013). Kalman-Bucy filtering with diffusion approximation for Bivariate Dynamic Contagion Processes. *Working paper*.

[12] Dassios, A. and Jang, J.-W. (2003). Pricing of catastrophe reinsurance and derivatives using the Cox process with shot noise intensity. *Finance and Stochastics* **7,** 73–95.

[13] Dassios, A. and Zhao, H. (2011). A dynamic contagion process. *Advances in applied probability* **43,** 814–846.

[14] Dassios, A. and Zhao, H. (2012). Ruin by dynamic contagion claims. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **51,** 93–106.

[15] Davis, M. H. (1984). Piecewise-deterministic markov processes: A general class of non-diffusion stochastic models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 353–388.

[16] Duffie, D., Filipovic, D. and Schachermayer, W. (2003). Affine processes and applications in finance. *Annals of Applied Probability* **13,** 984–1053.

[17] Embrechts, P., Liniger, T. and Lin, L. (2011). Multivariate hawkes processes: an application to financial data. *Journal of Applied Probability* **48,** 367–378.

[18] Errais, E., Giesecke, K. and Goldberg, L. R. (2010). Affine point processes and portfolio credit risk. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics* **1,** 642–665.

[19] Ethier, S. N. and Kurtz, T. G. (1986). *Markov processes: characterization and convergence*. John Wiley and Sons.

[20] Glasserman, P. and Kim, K.-K. (2010). Moment explosions and stationary distributions in affine diffusion models. *Mathematical Finance* **20,** 1–33.

[21] Hawkes, A. G. and Oakes, D. (1974). A cluster process representation of a self-exciting process. *Journal of Applied Probability* **11,** 493–503.

[22] Jang, J. and Dassios, A. (2013). A bivariate shot noise self-exciting process for insurance. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **53,** 524–532.

[23] Keller-Ressel, M., Schachermayer, W. and Teichmann, J. (2011). Affine processes are regular. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **151,** 591–611.

[24] Klüppelberg, C. and Mikosch, T. (1995). Explosive poisson shot noise processes with applications to risk reserves. *Bernoulli* **1,** 125–147.

[25] Liniger, T. J. (2009). Multivariate hawkes processes. *PhD thesis*. Diss., Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule ETH Zürich, Nr. 18403, 2009.

[26] Macci, C. and Torrisi, G. L. (2011). Risk processes with shot noise Cox claim number process and reserve dependent premium rate. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **48,** 134–145.

[27] Møller, J. (2003). Shot noise Cox processes. *Advances in Applied Probability* **35,** 614–640.

[28] Zhao, H. and Dassios, A. (2011). A dynamic contagion process and an application to credit risk. *Available at SSRN 2039798*.

A Proof of Lemma

A.1 Proof of Lemma 3.3

Proof. First, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} l_1(t) = \lim_{t\to\infty} v_{2n}e^{-\delta_2 t} = 0, \quad \lim_{t\to\infty} l_2(t) = \lim_{t\to\infty} v_{2n-1}e^{-\delta_1 t} = 0.$$

Then, assume $\lim_{t\to\infty} l_{2k-1}(t) = 0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} l_{2k}(t) = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{t\to\infty} l_{2k+1}(t) &= \lim_{t\to\infty} e^{-\delta_2 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_2 s}\left[1-\hat{g}_{1,2}(l_{2k}(s))+1-\hat{g}_{2,2}(l_{2k-1}(s))\right]ds\\ &\overset{L'Hospital}{=} \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{1}{\delta_2}\left(1-\hat{g}_{1,2}(l_{2k}(t))+1-\hat{g}_{2,2}(l_{2k-1}(t))\right)\\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $\lim_{t\to\infty} l_{2k+2}(t) = 0$.

Hence, by induction, we conclude that for any $i = 1, \ldots, m$, $\lim_{t\to\infty} l_i(t) = 0$.

□

A.2 Proof of Lemma 4.1

Proof. By Proposition 9.2, Chapter 4 in Ethier and Kurtz [19], the stationary distribution μ exists if and only if for $f \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$, $\int \mathcal{A}f d\mu = 0$. Hence we show the stationary distribution π satisfies

$$\int \mathcal{A}_m f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_m)\pi(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots, \lambda_m)d\lambda_1 \cdots d\lambda_n = 0. \tag{23}$$

We now derive the equivalent Laplace transform equation.

Part (I): drift part

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} -\delta_k\lambda_k\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m\\ =\ & -\delta_k\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\int_0^{\lambda_k}\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}\left(x\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,x,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right)dxd\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m\\ =\ & -\delta_k\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{m-1}}\int_{\lambda_k=0}^{\infty}\int_{x=0}^{\lambda_k}\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}\left(x\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,x,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right)dxd\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m\\ =\ & -\delta_k\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{m-1}}\int_{x=0}^{\infty}\int_{\lambda_k=x}^{\infty}\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}\left(x\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,x,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right)dxd\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m\\ =\ & \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m} f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\delta_k\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}\left(\lambda_k\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right)d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)|_{\lambda_k=\infty}=0$.

Take the Laplace transform at $(v_1,\ldots,v_m)$ is

$$\mathcal{L}_m\left[\delta_k\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}\left(\lambda_k\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right)\right]=\delta_k v_k\mathcal{L}_m[\lambda_k\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)]=-\delta_k v_k\frac{\partial}{\partial v_k}\hat{\pi}(v_1,\ldots,v_m).$$

Part (II): shot-noise part

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}\rho_1\int_{y=0}^{\infty}f(\lambda_1+y,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_1(y)\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m\\
=\;&\rho_1\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^{m-1}}\int_{x=0}^{\infty}f(x,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)\int_{y=0}^{x}\pi(x-y,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_1(y)dxd\lambda_2\cdots d\lambda_m\\
=\;&\rho_1\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}f(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)\int_{y=0}^{\lambda_1}\pi(\lambda_1-y,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_1(y)d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m,
\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}\rho_1\left[\int_0^{\infty}f(\lambda_1+y,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_1(y)-f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m\\
=\;&\rho_1\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}f(\lambda_1,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)\left[\int_{y=0}^{\lambda_1}\pi(\lambda_1-y,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_1(y)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m.
\end{aligned}$$

We have the Laplace transform as

$$\mathcal{L}_m\left[\int_{y=0}^{\lambda_1}\pi(\lambda_1-y,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_1(y)\right]=\hat{\pi}(v_1,\ldots,v_m)\hat{h}(v_1).$$

Similarly, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_m\left[\int_{y=0}^{\lambda_2}\pi(\lambda_1,\lambda_2-y,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_1(y)\right]=\hat{\pi}(v_1,\ldots,v_m)\hat{h}(v_2).$$

Part(III): exciting part:

For $k\geq 2$, the jump excited by λ_{2k-1} is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}\lambda_{2k-1}\left[\left(\int_{z=0}^{\infty}f(\cdot,\lambda_{2k+1}+z,\cdot)dG_{1,1}(z)-f(\ldots)\right)+\left(\int_{z=0}^{\infty}f(\cdot,\lambda_{2k+2}+z,\cdot)dG_{2,1}(z)-f(\ldots,)\right)\right]\\
&\cdot\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m\\
=\;&\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\lambda_{2k-1}\left[\int_{z=0}^{\lambda_{2k+1}}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{2k+1}-z,\ldots,\lambda_m)dG_{1,1}(z)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_n\\
&+\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}f(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\lambda_{2k-1}\left[\int_{z=0}^{\lambda_{2k+2}}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{2k+2}-z,\ldots,\lambda_m)dG_{2,1}(z)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_n
\end{aligned}$$

We have first

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_m\left[\lambda_{2k-1}\int_{z=0}^{\lambda_{2k+1}}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{2k+1}-z,\ldots,\lambda_m)dG_{1,1}(z)-\lambda_{2k-1}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\\
=\;&\mathcal{L}_m\left[\lambda_{2k-1}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\hat{g}_{1,1}(v_{2k+1})-\mathcal{L}_m\left[\lambda_{2k-1}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\\
=\;&\frac{\partial}{\partial v_{2k-1}}\hat{\pi}(v_1,\ldots,v_m)(1-\hat{g}_{1,1}(v_{2k+1})).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}_m\left[\lambda_{2k-1}\int_{z=0}^{\lambda_{2k+2}}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{2k+2}-z,\ldots,\lambda_m)dG_{2,1}(z)-\lambda_{2k-1}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\\
=\;&\frac{\partial}{\partial v_{2k-1}}\hat{\pi}(v_1,\ldots,v_m)(1-\hat{g}_{2,1}(v_{2k+2})).
\end{aligned}$$

The same for jumps excited by λ_{2k} corresponding to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathbb{R}_+^m}\lambda_{2k}\left[\left(\int_{z=0}^{\infty}f(\cdot,\lambda_{2k+1}+z,\cdot)dG_{1,2}(z)-f(\ldots)\right)+\left(\int_{z=0}^{\infty}f(\cdot,\lambda_{2k+2}+z,\cdot)dG_{2,2}(z)-f(\ldots,)\right)\right]\\
&\cdot\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)d\lambda_1\cdots d\lambda_m.
\end{aligned}$$

Since stationary distribution π satisfies (23), we have from part (I), (II), (III) that

$$\begin{aligned}
0\;=\;&\sum_{k=1}^{m}\delta_k\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda_k}\left(\lambda_k\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right)\\
&+\rho_1\left[\int_{y=0}^{\lambda_1}\pi(\lambda_1-y,\lambda_2,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_1(y)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\\
&+\rho_2\left[\int_{y=0}^{\lambda_2}\pi(\lambda_1,\lambda_2-y,\ldots,\lambda_m)dH_2(y)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\\
&+\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\lambda_{2k-1}\left[\int_{z=0}^{\lambda_{2k+1}}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{2k+1}-z,\ldots,\lambda_m)dG_{1,1}(z)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\\
&+\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\lambda_{2k-1}\left[\int_{z=0}^{\lambda_{2k+2}}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{2k+2}-z,\ldots,\lambda_m)dG_{2,1}(z)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\\
&+\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\lambda_{2k}\left[\int_{z=0}^{\lambda_{2k+1}}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{2k+1}-z,\ldots,\lambda_m)dG_{1,2}(z)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right]\\
&+\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\lambda_{2k}\left[\int_{z=0}^{\lambda_{2k+2}}\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_{2k+2}-z,\ldots,\lambda_m)dG_{2,2}(z)-\pi(\lambda_1,\ldots,\lambda_m)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

In terms of Laplace transform, we have for any $(v_1,\ldots,v_m)\in\mathbb{R}_+^m$

$$\begin{aligned}
0\;=\;&-\sum_{k=1}^{2n}\delta_k v_k\frac{\partial\hat{\pi}_S^m}{\partial v_k}+\rho_1(\hat{h}(v_1)-1)+\rho_2(\hat{h}(v_2)-1)\\
&+\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\frac{\partial\hat{\pi}_S^m}{\partial v_{2k-1}}\left[(1-\hat{g}_{1,1}(v_{2k+1}))+(1-\hat{g}_{2,1}(v_{2k+2}))\right]+\sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\frac{\partial\hat{\pi}_S^m}{\partial v_{2k}}\left[(1-\hat{g}_{1,2}(v_{2k+1}))+(1-\hat{g}_{2,2}(v_{2k+2}))\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Reorder the terms, we have (15). □

A.3 Proof of (11)

Proof. For $j=1,2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{g}_{1,j}(l_{2k-2}(t))-\hat{g}_{1,j}(l_{2k}(t))&=\int_{l_{2k}(t)}^{l_{2k-2}(t)}d\hat{g}_{1,j}(u)=\int_{l_{2k-2}(t)}^{l_{2k}(t)}\left(-\hat{g}'_{1,j}(u)\right)du\le\mu_{G^{1,j}}\left(l_{2k}(t)-l_{2k-2}(t)\right)\\
\hat{g}_{2,j}(l_{2k-3}(t))-\hat{g}_{2,j}(l_{2k-1}(t))&=\int_{l_{2k-1}(t)}^{l_{2k-3}(t)}d\hat{g}_{2,j}(u)=\int_{l_{2k-3}(t)}^{l_{2k-1}(t)}\left(-\hat{g}'_{2,j}(u)\right)du\le\mu_{G^{2,j}}\left(l_{2k-1}(t)-l_{2k-3}(t)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{k+1}^{(1)}(t) &= e^{-\delta_2 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_2 s}\left[(1-\hat{g}_{1,2}(l_{2k}(s)))-(1-\hat{g}_{1,2}(l_{2k-2}(s)))\right]ds \\
&\quad +e^{-\delta_2 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_2 s}\left[(1-\hat{g}_{2,2}(l_{2k-1}(s)))-(1-\hat{g}_{2,2}(l_{2k-3}(s)))\right]ds \\
&\leq e^{-\delta_2 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_2 s}\left[\mu_{G^{2,2}}d_k^{(1)}(s)+\mu_{G^{1,2}}d_k^{(2)}(s)\right]ds \\
d_{k+1}^{(2)}(t) &= e^{-\delta_1 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_1 s}\left[(1-\hat{g}_{1,1}(l_{2k}(s)))-(1-\hat{g}_{1,1}(l_{2k-2}(s)))\right]ds \\
&\quad +e^{-\delta_1 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_1 s}\left[(1-\hat{g}_{2,1}(l_{2k-1}(s)))-(1-\hat{g}_{2,1}(l_{2k-3}(s)))\right]ds \\
&\leq e^{-\delta_1 t}\int_0^t e^{\delta_1 s}\left[\mu_{G^{2,1}}d_k^{(1)}(s)+\mu_{G^{1,1}}d_k^{(2)}(s)\right]ds
\end{aligned}$$

□